



MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The second ordinary meeting of the Council for the 2018/19 session, to be held on Tuesday 23 October in RSM G01, at 18:30.

Present

Name & Role	Yes/No
Hoi-Ming Yau Cag Chair	Y
Michaela Flegrova Rcsu Vice President (Education)	Y
Aisha Chaudry Welfare Officer (Icsmsu)	Y
Shervin Sabeghi Welfare Officer (Rcsu)	Y
Chloe Lewis Welfare Officer (Rsm)	Y
Thomas Fernandez Debets Sport Sector Chair	Y
Joseph O'connell-Danes A&E Chair	Y
James Medler Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)	Y
Alejandro Luy Deputy President (Education)	Y
Claudia Caravello Deputy President (Finance & Services)	Y
Andrew Hill Cgcu President	Y
Becky Neil Deputy President (Welfare)	Y
Ute Thiermann Gsu President	N
Daniel Faehndrich Icsmsu President	Y
Chimdi Igwe Osc Chair	Y
Robert Tomkies Union President	Y
Thomas Pleece Rcc Chair	Y
Amy Tall Academic Liasion Officer (Rsm)	N
Marta Wolinska Rsm President	Y
Daniel Wigh	Y

Kn Chair	
Deraj Wilson-Aggarwal Silwood Chair	Y
Michael McGill RCSU PRESIDENT	Y
Alistair Ludley Academic Chair	Y
Charlotte Griaud Environmental Officer	N
David Tyoember Bme Officer	N
Samuel Haselgrove Disabilities Officer	Y
Salma El-Ghrably Interfaith Officer	N
Tasneem Mahmud Mental Health Officer	Y
Laura Chen International Officer	Y
Shiyong Liu Gender Equality Officer	N
Joel <u>Bilsdorfer</u> Aao Cgcu	Y
David Tyoember Bme Officer	N
Danai Paidousi Representative To Council (PG Engineering)	Y
Milia Hasbani Representative To Council (PG Engineering)	N
Zixiao Wang Representative To Council (PG Engineering)	Y
Sarah Sayers Representative To Council (PG Medicine)	Y
Hilary Guite Representative To Council (PG Non Faculty)	Y
Lloyd James Representative To Council (PG Science)	Y
Mary Thi Representative To Council (PG Science)	Y
Miroslav Gasperek Representative To Council (UG Engineering)	Y
Maurice Yap Representative To Council (UG Engineering)	Y
Owen Heaney Representative To Council (UG Engineering)	Y
Simran Kukran Representative To Council (UG Engineering)	Y
Jack Hall Representative To Council (UG Medicine)	Y
Waseem Hasan	Y

Representative To Council (UG Medicine)	
Ansh Bhatnagar Representative To Council (UG Science)	Y
Adrian Lamoury Representative To Council (UG Science)	Y
Iman Ahmadi Moghaddam Representative To Council (UG Science)	Y
Jeh (Jehna Devraj) LGBT Officer	Y

Apologies

Amy Tall Academic Liasion Officer (Rsm)	
Milia Hasbani (PG Engineering Rep to Council)	
David Tyoember Bme Officer	

Minutes

<p>Chairs business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Welcome ▫ Apologies for absences ▫ Audio recording Union Council ▫ Seating plan Union Council 	<p>The Chair welcomed the Committee to the first ordinary meeting of the Council for the 2018/19 session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Apologies for late start II. Trialing audio recording Union Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. To record the minutes II. To have different formatting for the minutes III. Discussion regarding trialing audio recording of Union Council to take place on 13 November III. Trialing Seating Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. To connect with new people II. To manage discussions better III. Questionnaire to be produced to review seating plan (in future) IV. Test Vote V. Union Council standing orders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Chair asked for volunteers to Chair, in order for the Chair to present
Item 4	<p>The paper was presented by Council chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Chair described report

	<p>II. Chair mentioned two errors to be amended</p> <p>Discussion overview: Chair asked for any questions from the floor</p> <p>Question/Comments</p> <p>I. There was an ask for flexibility regarding the 5pm call for papers deadline</p> <p>II. There was a comment on the membership of CWB being incorrect</p> <p>III. There was a comment on the position of 'ordinary members' being in correct</p> <p>IV. There was an ask regarding the changes to the CSPB</p> <p>V. Clarity was asked regarding standing order 24</p> <p>VI. There was a comment clarifying that CWB and ERB committees power is to allocate funding</p> <p>VII. There was a comment regarding standing order 4 on voting secretly. Considered if the two thirds majority vote is fair with the same only 50% + 1 threshold. Or should that be equivalent simple majority votes required requires simple majority secrecy and two thirds requires two thirds</p> <p>Response</p> <p>I. Chair explained the reason for the 5pm paper deadline</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">I. Chair promised to consider changing the 5pm deadline after November if it appears to be difficult for paper submitters to adhere to</p> <p>II. Chair agreed to amend CWB membership</p> <p>III. Chair agreed to change ordinary members position to Representatives to Council</p> <p>IV. Deputy President Clubs & Societies President confirmed that CSPB membership had changed and changes will be sent over</p>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> V. Chair explained standing order 24 and spoke more on how shared vote for members holding a shared seat worked VI. Chair agreed to work on appendix B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. It was agreed to vote on the standing orders not including Appendix B VII. It was suggested that two thirds majority was a high barrier <p>Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Standing order 1 to be amended to state: definitions and interpretations of terms used shall be defines as in constitution and bye laws II. Standing order 27: should be standing order 26 III. Chair to amend CWB membership IV. Chair to change everywhere where is states 'ordinary member' to representative to council V. Deputy President Clubs & Societies president to send changes regarding CSPB membership VI. Chair to re-present Appendix B <p>Resolved: To Accept the Chair Report excluding Appendix to Standing Orders– PASSED</p>
<p>Item 5</p>	<p>The paper was presented by Knowledge Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. It was mentioned that this paper was discussed in previous academic year, but was not voted on due to lack of members II. Knowledge Chair described paper III. Knowledge Chair shared an example scenario of how sexual misconduct currently works at college Union IV. Knowledge Chair mentioned wanting to make rules regarding sexual misconduct holistic V. Council Chair agreed that the duration of the sanction for those found guilty of sexual misconduct can be proposed and the paper can be brought back to Council to vote on <p>Discussion Overview:</p>

- I. Knowledge Chair stated being aware of the wording
- II. Knowledge chair was ensure that the Union sanctions would be consistent
 - I. Examples were provided for the purpose of clarity
 - II. Knowledge chair suggested that Officer Trustee's put pressure on College to extend the cooperation of disciplinary procedures.
- III. Knowledge chair mentioned a working group to include student leaders to come together to create ideas

Knowledge Chair asked for any questions from the floor

Question/Comments

- I. There was an ask for clarity on how guilt is defined
 - I. Whether there was a clear explicit definition to defining guilt and how this related to the colleges policy
- II. There was an ask as to why the Union doesn't ban sexual misconduct perpetrators from being members of the club
- III. There was an ask for an amendment if a person is later found not guilty, therefore for all the sanctions to be revoked
- IV. It was suggested that a duration on the ban should be included
- V. An amendment was proposed for a duration of X amount of years and then after this time period for there to be possible opportunity to apply for reconsideration
- VI. A comment was received regarding Union resolves 2 because of GDPR and data protection. Therefore, it may be challenging and sometimes not possible for Union President and Deputy President Welfare to ask for this information.

	<p>VII. Union President mentioned the Stonewall recommendations but this will not be in process until some months</p> <p>VIII. It was mentioned that the term sexual misconduct was broad therefore a time duration of 7 years at the minimum should be considered</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. It was not certain as to who would concludes on the 7 years <p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Knowledge Chair confirmed that the paper is not proposing to change how guilt is defined, or address the processes of finding someone guilty/not guilty <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. It was explained that there was a distinction between Union’s policy and the college’s policy’s II. It was explained that the Governance committee deals with who defines how sexual misconduct is dealt with III. It was stated that the definition of sexual misconduct is still to be determined on a level higher than Union or College II. Knowledge Chair explained that the Union is not able to remove people from the university and this was only possible from a College level <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Similarly, the Knowledge chair explained that removing members was not the focus of this particular paper III. Knowledge Chair mentioned that the bye-laws explained further about the process of revoking sanctions IV. Knowledge Chair was against a duration of time for a ban due to the principle V. Knowledge Chair accepted the 7 years amendment, however this was on the assurance that the working group could make recommendation and based on their conclusion the time duration of the sanction may be changed
--	--

	<p>I. Knowledge Chair mentioned that the Governance committee decides the duration of the sanction</p> <p>Action</p> <p>I. Union President and Deputy President Welfare were sanctioned to report back about how conversations from the College have gone –before the end of term</p> <p>II. Knowledge Chair to chair working group to research and provide recommendations.</p> <p>I. Working group to provide a duration of time period for a ban/sanction that will be appropriate</p> <p>Resolved: To Accept the Paper with the time duration of 7 years – PASSED</p> <p>Accept: 98% Rejected: 10% Abstained: 2%</p> <p>Resolved: To have a time limitation on sanction – PASSED</p> <p>Accept: 59% Reject: 37% Abstain: 5%</p>
<p>Item 6</p>	<p>The paper was summarised by Owen Heaney Representative to Council (UG Engineering)</p> <p>I. The paper was described</p> <p>Resolved: to accept the Council (UG Engineering) paper</p> <p>– PASSED</p> <p>Accept: 88% Rejected: 5% Abstain: 7%</p>
<p>Item 7</p>	<p>The paper was presented by Ben Slater</p> <p>1. Informs the floor of the meeting regarding that was had with Ethos center regarding the squash court pricing</p> <p>2. Paper is described</p> <p>Questions/Comments</p> <p>1. The time utilisation of squash courts and bookings were explained</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The cost and competitor analysis were explained <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The cost was £14,000 and there was no usage of that to subsidise the gym b. It was mentioned that lobbying Ethos to reduce prices will affect another service 3. There was a suggestion to ask for more money for student services 4. There was a suggestion to add a Union resolve lobbying ethos to allow a reasonable price for bringing guests to play squash <p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paper proposer accepted the amendment to lobby ethos to allow a reasonable price for bringing guests to play squash <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ben Slater to add a Union resolve lobbying ethos to allow a reasonable price for bringing guests to play squash to paper 2. Deputy President Clubs & Societies to provide an analysis of different membership models in relation with the change of pricing recently <p>Resolved: to accept the paper and amendment – PASSED</p> <p>Accept: 68% Reject: 2% Abstain 29%</p>
<p>Item 8</p>	<p>The paper was presented by Ansh Bhatnagar Representative to Council (UG Science)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Paper is described <p>Questions/Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. It was mentioned that there should be freedom of speech not censorship II. It was mentioned that students should be given variety III. It was suggested that the Union and their members should provide

	<p>statements to the press complaints commission</p> <p>IV. It was mentioned that students shouldn't be limited to Felix and financial times</p> <p>V. It was stated that the Union shop choses to stock these papers therefore the Union shouldn't be supporting newspapers of this nature finically and profiting off of them</p> <p>VI. It was emphasised that the Union shouldn't be giving racist newspapers a platform</p> <p>VII. It was mentioned that banning the racist paper is too extreme and publishing opposing views and concerns regarding the paper can be provide through Felix</p> <p>VIII. It was mentioned that banning the racist papers makes a statement as a Union of anti-racism, anti-exclusion etc.</p> <p>IX. A comment as received to advertise the racist papers face down and out of sight is the headlines as the issue</p> <p>X. A commented was received suggesting that newspapers shouldn't be banned in an educational establishment</p> <p>XI. It was suggested that selling at a cost would be a good alternative, hence, the Union shop would not profit from it</p> <p>XII. There was an ask if any student consultation was done in Shop Extra regarding the removal of the newspaper from the shop</p> <p>XIII. It was mentioned that the profit of papers should go to non-profit charities</p> <p>XIV. It was mentioned that the papers should be sold behind the counter</p> <p>XV. It was stated that there should eb a review whether the papers should be stocked or not</p> <p>XVI. It was suggested that the Union should help launch complaints</p> <p>XVII. There was a suggestion for the profits of the racist paper to be granted to Felix</p> <p>XVIII. There was a suggestion to stop selling any papers on the Union shop</p>
--	--

XIX. It was mentioned that a group should be created who reports specific headlines that are incorrect/inappropriate

Response

- I. Representative to Council (UG Science) feels that the Union shouldn't be profiting off these papers
- II. **The paper prospers rejected** the profits of the racist paper to be granted to Felix

Resolved: amendment one- for whether or not the Union Shop sells no newspapers or tabloids

Want them to sell newspapers/tabloids: 73%

Don't want them to sell newspapers/tabloids: 12%

Abstain: 14%

Resolved: amendment two- whether the Union sells and stocks papers at all

Continue stocking them: 68%

Shouldn't stock them: 24%

Abstain: 7%

Resolved: amendment three- whether three papers are not on display and instead behind the counter and would need to be requested

Put behind the counter and request: 34%

Keep them where they are: 49%

Abstain: 17%

Resolved: amendment four- Whether or not the profits from selling the papers should go to anti-racist campaign groups

Profits should go to anti-racist groups: 80%

Keep £100 a year for the Union: 2%

Abstain: 17%

Resolved: amendment five- to start in efforts to lodge complaints against newspapers printing racist content (exactly how to be defined)

	<p>Make an effort and lodge complaints: 78%</p> <p>Not going to do anything and continue and normal 15%</p> <p>Abstain: 7%</p> <p>Resolved: Amendment six-to review which newspapers get stocked in Union Shop Extra - PASSED</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The specific anti-racist campaign groups would be considered at future Council meeting
Extend the meeting	<p>Resolved: to extend the meeting</p> <p>Propose extending it for 15 minutes: 79%</p> <p>Reject finish now: 15%</p> <p>Abstain: 5%</p>
Item 9	<p>The paper was presented by Union President</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Introduced the paper as tabled II. Union President explained that the paper was brought to Council in the previous academic year <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. It was mentioned that appointed trustees have been doing stuff on the trustee board prior to ever have been ratified, therefore, they should be recognized <p>Resolved: to ratify that the appointed student trustees. Appointed for a year with a possible extra year if they're reappointed after a year – PASSED</p> <p>Accept: 79% Reject: 28% Abstain: 10%</p>
Item 10	Delayed to Council meeting 12 November
Ending the meeting	<p>Motion to end the meeting and reports to go to an email vote and Chair to circulate as an email vote</p> <p>End now: 62% Extend meeting: 28% Abstain: 10%</p>
Item 20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Chair explained that Council are electing two representatives on health

	<p>and safety committee in which elections will open soon</p> <p>II. It was mentioned that questions regarding the health and safety committee can be directed to Deputy President Finance & Services President</p> <p>III. It was explained that all information regarding this election will be sent to members</p>
Chair	Meeting closed.

Minutes: Harriet Williams, Democracy Coordinator